DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 401 643 EA 028 095

AUTHOR Hausman, Charles S.; Goldring, Ellen B.
TITLE Teachers' Ratings of Effective Principal Leadership: A Comparison of Magnet and Nonmagnet Schools.
PUB DATE Oct 96
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (10th, Louisville, KY, October 25-27, 1996).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Effectiveness; Elementary Education; Institutional Characteristics; *Leadership; *Magnet Schools; Multivariate Analysis; Open Enrollment; Prediction; *Principals; Regression (Statistics); School Choice; *Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Conditions; *Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS *Cincinnati Public Schools OH

ABSTRACT

Despite their common goal, reformers promoting school choice and those seeking ways to improve schools through more effective principal leadership have remained for the most part disconnected. This paper presents findings of a study that examined differences in teachers' ratings of effective principal leadership in magnet and nonmagnet schools in Cincinnati's (Ohio) system of school choice. The study also examined the influence of school demographics, student achievement, teacher professionalism, and workplace conditions on teachers' ratings of effective principal leadership. The sample included 10 magnet schools and 10 nonmagnet schools. A survey of all teachers in the sample schools (n=628) elicited 417 returns, a 66 percent response rate. Nonmagnet principals were rated as more effective leaders by their teachers than were nonmagnet principals. There was a lack of correlation between teachers' ratings of effective principal leadership and student outcomes. Indicators of teacher professionalism appeared to be the strongest predictors of effective principal leadership as rated by teachers, particularly teachers' perceptions of their opportunity to learn. Goal congruence and resources were significant predictors in both school types, and may be even more critical factors in nonmagnet schools. In magnet schools, greater school size was correlated with lower ratings of principal effectiveness. The discussion offers possible reasons for the findings. Four tables are included. (Contains 29 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 401 643

Teachers' Ratings of Effective Principal Leadership: A Comparison of Magnet and Nonmagnet Schools

Charles S. Hausman
University of Maine

Ellen B. Goldring
Vanderbilt University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Hausman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Paper presented at the University Council for Educational Administration's Annual Convention, Louisville, 1996.

EA028095

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teachers' Ratings of Effective Principal Leadership: A Comparison of Magnet and Nonmagnet Schools

Introduction

The shortcomings of public schooling in America have been highly publicized. Although there is some debate over the magnitude of the problem, there is unanimous agreement that there is room for significant improvement. A potpourri of remedies have been urged but perhaps none more vehemently than school choice. The call for school choice has been issued with such force that the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1992) concluded: "THE DECADE-LONG STRUGGLE to reform American education seems suddenly to hang on a single word: choice" (p. 1).

Magnet schools are the most widespread form of school choice. They are characterized by four qualities: (1) a thematic curriculum (e.g., international studies) or unique method of instruction (e.g., Paideia); (2) admissions criteria to facilitate voluntary desegregation; (3) choice of school by families; and (4) access to pupils beyond neighborhood attendance zones (Blank, 1990). The popularity of magnet schools stems from their purported ability to achieve voluntary desegregation, school improvement, and innovation. As Blank (1990) notes:

> The first magnet schools were designed in the early 1970s; in 1982-83, one-third of the largest urban districts had magnet schools; and today it would be difficult to find an urban school system without a magnet program. (p. 77)

During the 1991-92 school year, 230 school systems operated 2,400 magnet schools and 3,200 individual magnet programs in the United States. These magnet schools and programs served 1.2 million students. 68% of all urban students were educated in magnet settings (Steel and Levine, 1994).

While many reformists are championing choice initiatives, others have turned their attention to the principalship as the key to school improvement. Consistent with this emphasis, Bredeson (1989) has reminded us that effective schools research has indicated repeatedly that "the behavior of the school principal is the single most important factor supporting high quality educational programs" and "while schools make a difference in what students learn, principals make a difference in schools" (pp. 298-299). Morris, Crowson, Hurwitz, and Porter-Gehrie (1982) have contended that the principalship is so critical that it "should be the most thoroughly researched and best understood position in education" (p. 689).

Despite their common goal, to date, reformers promoting school choice and those seeking ways to improve schools through more effective principal leadership have remained for the most part isolated. This lack of a connection is ironic since school choice programs are expected to alter the traditional roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders involved in the education of children (Chubb and Moe, 1990). The principalship is no exception.

In light of the relatively unexamined linkage between school choice and leadership, this paper has two primary objectives. First, the paper explores differences in teachers' ratings of effective principal leadership in magnet and nonmagnet schools. All magnet schools in this study are schools of choice. They do not have attendance zones, and their enrollments are comprised entirely of students who have formally applied and been admitted. On the contrary, students in the nonmagnet schools are automatically assigned by central office personnel based on neighborhood boundaries. In this system, all parents do not have to choose. Second, the paper investigates the contexts of magnet and nonmagnet schools in terms of the nature of teacher workplace conditions, student achievement, and school demographics, and examines the extent to which these variables are related to principal leadership effectiveness.

Effective Principal Leadership

The study of leadership has led to a plethora of conclusions and little consensus about what effective principal leadership entails. Effective principals have been described as: committed to a vision, proactive in their work, and able to avoid being consumed by administrivia (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1986); expert problem finders and solvers (Leithwood and Stager, 1986); environmental leaders and boundary spanners (Goldring and Rallis, 1993); able to views problems through multiple frames (Bolman and Deal, 1991); student centered and focused on teaching and learning (Elmore, 1979-80); and servant and moral leaders (Sergiovanni, 1992). This list far from saturates conceptions of effective principal leadership presently being advocated. It merely serves as testimony to the lack of clarity in the concept.

Leadership in Schools of Choice

"Against the assumption that 'leaders make things happen,' it is important to counterpose the proposition that 'things make leaders happen'" (Bolman, Moore-Johnson, Murphy, and Weiss, 1990, p. 22). Consistent with this proposition, researchers have begun to emphasize the importance of studying principal leadership in specific contexts to more fully understand the role (Hallinger and Murphy, 1986; Leithwood, 1988; Zheng, 1996). However, contextual variables have continued to be underemphasized. Empirical evidence on principals in schools of choice has remained scant, with most work occurring at the theoretical level. This lack of research is conspicuous by its absence in light of the wholesale changes predicted for leaders in choice settings. Kerchner (1988) envisions, "If choice became the dominant metaphor of education, it would fundamentally alter the nature of school administration..." (p. 381).

Finn (1990) cites "good leadership on the part of principals" (p. 4) as one of six reasons why school choice should be implemented. His rationale for this is simply that school choice is congruent with bottom-up reform, which is characterized by

the empowerment of teachers and principals. These professionals will use this empowerment to transform their schools to respond to client preferences. Thus, greater influence at the site level and accountability to parents are the catalysts for effective leadership in a market system of schooling. The importance of principal leadership for magnet school effectiveness has been supported by the one study that has addressed this relationship (Blank, Dentler, Baltzell, and Chabotar, 1983).

As a result of more permeable boundaries, thematic curricula or special instructional approaches, and increased responsiveness and accountability to parents in schools of choice, Crow (1991) and Kerchner (1988) have developed theoretical frameworks for how the principal's role may be different in choice environments. While Kerchner uses bureaucratic entrepreneur as the metaphor for leadership in schools of choice, Crow posits that principals will serve as middle managers, entrepreneurs, and symbol managers.

Experimental data has affirmed the premium placed on entrepreneurial leadership in schools of choice. In a study of magnet school principals, Morgan (1987) observed, "The magnet principals universally perceived themselves as effective salespersons..." (p. 122). This finding is congruent with the conclusions of Hallinger and Hausman (1993) who report that principals in schools of choice spend increased time marketing their school's programs and services. Specifically, the principals in their study allocated additional time to parent tours, informational meetings, and the creation of marketing tools such as brochures.

The principal's role as middle manager in several types of schools, including schools of choice, has also received preliminary support. From her study of a sample of elementary public school principals in Israel, Goldring (1993) concluded, "the principalship is becoming more a middle manager position than in the past; principals are in the middle of a triadic relationship with parents and superiors at the central office" (Goldring, 1993, p. 94). Hallinger and Hausman (1994) drew the

same conclusion after observing that principals of restructuring schools, which in their study included a choice component, are:

> sandwiched between local pressures exerted by school-based management and centralizing forces exerted by external mandates and central office personnel who are reluctant to relinquish their authority. The principals are under constant pressure to remain responsive to parents and staff, while simultaneously meeting the expectations of centrally imposed guidelines. (p. 163).

Given their unique contexts, are principals in schools of choice perceived differently or as more effective than their peers in more traditional, attendance zone settings? Blank (1986) provides the only direct evidence on this question. Relying on data collected from national surveys--one of comprehensive high schools, the other from magnet high schools--Blank concluded: "In general, more of the magnet school principals received high leadership ratings on more variables than did the principals of comprehensive high schools" (p. 13). Specifically, a greater percentage of magnet principals received higher ratings on "planning with staff", "making core curriculum decisions", and "staff selection." On the contrary, more nonmagnet principals were perceived as a "change agent." No significant difference was found in the extent to which they encouraged instructional innovation.

Research Questions

This study explores teachers' ratings of effective principal leadership in one urban system of school choice--Cincinnati. Specifically, this paper investigates two questions: (1) Do differences exist between magnet and nonmagnet teachers' ratings of effective principal leadership?, and (2) What influence do school background characteristics, student achievement, teacher professionalism, and other workplace conditions exert on teachers' ratings of effective principal leadership?

Cincinnati is a logical site to assess the consequences of school choice for two

primary reasons. First, the choice plan is well supported. Parent information centers assist families in the choice process, and the district provides transportation for students who choose alternative schools. Second, the system of school choice is highly institutionalized. Fifty-one percent of the schools in the district operate magnet programs.

Methodology

The Context of Choice in Cincinnati

As a result of the NAACP's litigation against the Cincinnati Public School District, a consent decree entitled the *Bronson Settlement* was issued in 1984. The settlement delineated goals for the reduction of segregation by 1991. As an effort to achieve these objectives, the school system expanded its' Alternative (i.e., magnet) School program. In 1992, the Federal District Court deemed supervision of the school system's racial/ethnic balance as no longer necessary. However, the school system remains committed to integration, which it accomplishes through Alternative and Open Enrollment plans.

Open Enrollment enables students from racially unbalanced schools to transfer to other schools in the district in which their enrollment would improve racial integration. The Open Enrollment and Alternative plans are limited to intradistrict choices. During the 1993-94 academic year, the district's Alternative plan (i.e., magnet schools) served approximately 20,000 students in 26 alternative programs at 44 sites. The entire school district included 86 schools: 61 elementary, eight middle/junior high, ten secondary, and seven special schools. The total enrollment was approximately 51,000 students, 66% of whom are African-American, 32% white, and 2% other. Forty-six percent of all students in the Cincinnati Public School District and 43% of African-American students were enrolled in magnet programs during the study period.

Cincinnati's alternative or magnet programs focus on thematic curricula (e.g.,

fine arts; foreign language and culture) or specialized instructional approaches (e.g., Paideia). Parents must formally apply for admission into the magnet schools. Acceptance is based on a first-come, first-served basis as long as racial/ethnic balance is enhanced. Applications are accepted on an announced, predetermined date at a site which is concealed until that date. Although the majority of parents receive their first choice of school, there is a larger number of applications than seats available, especially in more popular programs (e.g., Paideia, Montessori). Applying early increases the likelihood of acceptance but does not guarantee it. Consequently, parents are encouraged to rank their top three choices and submit separate applications for each.

Applicants may receive preferential treatment under three conditions.

(1) Sibling priority: A brother or sister presently attends the program to which the student is applying.

(2) Priority students: Members of the majority race in a racially unbalanced school (i.e., 90% or greater of one race) and incoming kindergarten students in the requested school's attendance area.

(3) Third grade priority: Awarded to students who finish third grade in one of the district's primary alternative programs.

To facilitate choice of alternative schools, the district provides transportation for all high school students and K-8 students who reside greater than one mile from their school of choice.

Sample Selection

During the summer of 1993, the Cincinnati Public School District provided a directory of all public elementary schools in the district. Schools containing a fourth and fifth grade, where the fourth grade was not the entry grade, were included in the original sample frame. These criteria resulted in schools with a substantial population of fifth grade students who had been enrolled in the school for one or

more years prior to the 1993-94 school year and whose parents would be familiar with the school program and personnel.

To reduce potential response bias due to transition, the initial sample frame was culled based on information provided by central office administrators. Schools were eliminated based on four additional criteria.

(1) Only full or dedicated magnet schools[1] were included.

(2) If for any reason, such as redistricting or renovation, fourth and fifth grade classes assigned to the school were not actually attending the school in 1992-93 or 1993-94, the school was deleted.

(3) Receiving schools of relocated students were also eliminated.

(4) Schools which added or dropped a magnet program within the past two years were omitted from the study.

The initial sample frame contained 32 magnet and 22 nonmagnet schools. The 15 full or dedicated magnets were included in the adjusted sample frame. Eight schools-within-schools, five mixed magnets, and four mixed schools-within-schools were deleted. Of the remaining 15 magnets, five were deleted because of planned programmatic changes that had caused tension in the community. Ten of the 22 nonmagnets were chosen by pair-matching them on racial balance using percent African-American with the ten remaining magnets in the study sample.

Data Collection

During the 1993-94 school year, anonymous surveys were distributed to all certified teachers in the sample schools. Members of the research team visited the schools and delivered the Teacher Surveys to a school contact person. The school contact person distributed the staff questionnaires in their mail boxes or at faculty meetings. Teachers returned the Teacher Survey in sealed envelopes directly to the

[1] (1) Full or dedicated magnet schools are defined as schools lacking an attendance zone that admit students based on a formal application process and provide alternative curriculum and instruction to all enrolled students.

school contact person, from whom they were picked up by members of the research team. Schools with response rates below 50% were targeted for follow-up that entailed a second round of visits and phone calls. Overall, four-hundred and seventeen teachers out of 628 sampled completed surveys for a 66.4% response rate.

Comparisons of the two groups of respondents revealed that they were similar. One-hundred and eighty six out of 291 nonmagnet teachers returned completed surveys for a 63.9% response rate. The nonmagnet respondents were predominantly female (91.2%), Caucasian (82.4%), and equally represented all grade levels. They averaged 6.7 years of experience at the school and 40.9% were educated at a Master's level or higher. Similarly, the response rate for magnet teachers was 68.5% with 231 respondents. This group was also primarily female (88.4%) and Caucasian (73.4%). Fifty-three percent held a Master's or higher, with 6.4 years as the mean teaching experience at the school. Thus, magnet and nonmagnet teachers share similar background characteristics. Moreover, these groups of respondents have backgrounds that are representative of the elementary teachers in the district.

Variables and Procedures

Analyses. To evaluate teachers' ratings of effective principal leadership in magnet and nonmagnet schools, descriptive and multivariate analyses were conducted. Descriptive results compared magnet and nonmagnet teachers' perceptions of overall effective leadership exhibited by their principals. Ordinary least squares regressions were run separately for magnet and nonmagnet school teachers to ascertain the variables that influence their ratings of effective principal leadership.

Dependent variable. The variable used to measure teachers' ratings of effective principal leadership was modified from a scale developed by Lee (1993). The final scale contained six items with α=.8792 (e.g., extra efforts by staff are acknowledged and/or rewarded by my principal).

Insert Appendix A Here

Predictor variables. School characteristics and teacher workplace conditions have been shown to affect principal leadership (Daresh and Liu, 1985; Hallinger and Heck, 1996). Therefore, the following independent variables were included in the analyses. School size, SES, and achievement comprised the school background variables. School size was measured by total student enrollment. School SES was represented by the percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch. Achievement was indicated by a composite of the average percentage of students demonstrating grade level mastery on standardized tests in Language, Reading, and Math.

Predictor variables created from teacher responses regarding their work environment were also included in the multivariate analyses. Work environment was divided into teacher professionalism and other workplace conditions. The following variables were created as indicators to assess the influence of teacher professionalism on ratings of effective principal leadership.

(1) Collegiality/collaboration; e.g., "Teachers in this school belong to a team which works well together"; (4 items, α=.7764);

(2) Teacher autonomy; e.g., "I know what is expected of me but I also have freedom to be creative"; (5 items, α=.6172);

(3) Teacher influence in decision-making; "How the school budget is spent"; (16 items, α=.9038); and

(4) Learning opportunities for teachers; e.g., "Inservice training and staff development programs in this school help teachers grow professionally"; (9 items, α=.8678).

Other workplace conditions assessed include:

(1) Bureaucracy; e.g., "Paperwork and red tape are a major burden here"; (single item);

(2) Goal congruence; e.g., "At this school, teachers agree on the objectives we're trying to teach"; (7 items, α=.8416); and

(3) Resources; e.g., "The school library has a sufficient collection of books and other instructional resources to support activities I have planned"; (8 items, α=.8000).

Table One summarizes descriptive data on the independent variables by school type. Simple t-tests indicate that magnet schools are characterized by larger enrollments; a higher percentage of students achieving mastery on a composite of achievement tests in Math, Reading, and Language Arts; increased teacher autonomy; and more abundant resources. Nonmagnet schools serve a higher percentage of students qualifying for free/reduced lunch and employ teachers who report larger levels of bureaucracy. No significant differences were found between magnet and nonmagnet teachers' reports of collegiality, influence, opportunities for professional growth, or goal congruence.

Insert Table One Here

Results

This section of the paper reports descriptive and multivariate analyses of teachers' ratings of effective principal leadership in one system of school choice. Descriptive and inferential statistics will be presented comparing magnet and nonmagnet teachers' ratings of the effectiveness of their principals. Multivariate

statististics will be employed to assess the influence of school background variables, indicators of teacher professionalism, and other workplace conditions on teacher ratings of effective leadership within magnet and nonmagnet schools.

Magnet vs. Nonmagnet Teachers' Ratings of Effective Principal Leadership

Table Two summarizes the results of a comparison of magnet and nonmagnet teachers' overall assessments of the leadership effectiveness of their principals. In this system, nonmagnet principals were rated as more effective leaders by their teachers than magnet principals. This finding contradicts an earlier study conducted by Blank (1986) that reported higher ratings received by magnet principals relative to their colleagues in more traditional urban schools. It is important to note that Blank's study compared school leaders across systems and utilized different instruments to collect data from the two groups. His analysis also compared single items rather than a scale variable.

Insert Table Two Here

Predictors of Effective Leadership in Magnet Schools

Table Three summarizes the results from three separate regressions on teacher ratings of effective principal leadership within magnet schools. The predictor variables in the three regressions include: school background variables, indicators of teacher professionalism, and other workplace conditions.

Among the school background variables, school size was the only significant predictor of effective principal leadership (β=-.209). As the total student enrollment increases, magnet principals were perceived by their teachers as less effective. Collectively, the school background variables accounted for only six percent of the

variance.

Indicators of teacher professionalism appear to be far greater predictors of effective principal leadership within magnet schools, accounting for 62.8% of the variance. While teacher autonomy was significant (β=-.108), teacher reports of their opportunities to learn and grow professionally (β=-.758) was a far more powerful predictor. Teacher collegiality and influence were non-significant.

Other workplace conditions were also powerful predictors of effective leadership ratings, jointly explaining 45.5% of the variance. Higher levels of bureaucracy (β=-.227) were correlated with less effective leadership. On the contrary, greater goal congruence (β=.473) and more resources (β=.186) resulted in elevated ratings of effectiveness.

Insert Table Three Here

Predictors of Effective Leadership in Nonmagnet Schools

Table Four outlines the results from three separate regressions on teacher ratings of effective principal leadership within nonmagnet schools. The predictor variables used in the magnet regressions were repeated for the nonmagnets.

School background variables accounted for only 12.8% of the variance in effective leadership ratings. Contrary to the findings in magnet schools, student achievement (β=.286) and school SES (i.e., % of students qualifying for free and reduced lunch) (β=.344) were significant. Higher percentages of students demonstrating mastery on achievement tests and a higher percentage of low SES

students were related to more positive reports of effective leadership. School size was non-significant.

Among the indicators of teacher professionalism, teacher opportunity-to-learn (β=.551) was the only significant predictor. Autonomy, collegiality, and influence were all non-significant but approaching a level of significance. These variables accounted for 66.9% of the variance in leadership ratings.

Other workplace conditions was also a powerful predictor, explaining 58.4% of the variance. As was the case in magnet schools, additional resources (β=.193) and greater goal congruence (β=.658) resulted in higher ratings of principal leadership. However, the level of bureaucracy was non-significant.

Insert Table Four Here

Conclusions

This study compares magnet and nonmagnet teachers' perceptions of effective principal leadership in one system of school choice. This section of the paper provides explanations that may account for differences found. The influence of school background variables, teacher professionalism, and other workplace are highlighted.

Teachers' Rating of Effective Principal Leadership in a Context of School Choice

The challenges of being a school principal have been well-documented. However, little thought has been given to how principal leadership is altered in a setting of school choice. It may be argued that market forces and more permeable boundaries place added role responsibilities and demands on magnet school

principals that make the role even more challenging. On the contrary, magnets have been criticized for creaming the *best* students and being awarded more than their fair share of resources. From this viewpoint, serving as a principal in a magnet school may be less challenging than in a more traditional school. Given these competing explanations, this study attempts to shed light on this question by comparing magnet and nonmagnet teachers' ratings of effective principal leadership.

There are several potential explanations for the finding in this study that nonmagnet teachers rated their principals as more effective leaders than their magnet school counterparts. First, more permeable boundaries characteristic of magnet schools compels magnet principals to allocate additional time to external management--marketing the school, forging business and community partnerships to support their theme, greater parental involvement because their parents are from a higher SES and chose the school. These additional responsibilities for external management leave less time for internal management. Thus, magnet principals are perceived as less visible by their teachers and less aware of what goes on in their classrooms. The added responsibility for external management in a more open system may also be creating role ambiguity that accounts for lower ratings of effective leadership.

School size is a second influence on magnet school principals' allocation of time. Overall, the enrollments in magnet schools were significantly greater than those in nonmagnet schools. Schools appear to reach a critical size at which principals are perceived as less effective. The number of staff increases with the number of students. As these numbers escalate, principals have proportionately less time for each individual. This, in turn, explains the less favorable perceptions held.

A third and ironic explanation for the higher ratings of effective leadership received by nonmagnet principals centers around problem density. Nonmagnet

schools serve a significantly higher percentage of children from low SES families. Moreover, they have fewer resources to meet this challenge. Confronting these challenges may help to create an image of a more effective leader. In addition, since nonmagnet schools in this district serve a more homogeneous environment in terms of SES, this may provide a clearer sense of purpose. In other words, the needs of the organization are more congruent with the role expectations so the principals are perceived as more effective.

Leadership substitutes provide a final rationale for the differences observed in leadership effective in this study (Pitner, 1986). In Cincinnati, magnet teachers report greater autonomy than their nonmagnet peers. When leadership is more dispersed, it may be more difficult for principals to be perceived as effective. Teacher leadership may make principal leadership in specific domains extraneous.

Influences on Magnet and Nonmagnet Teachers' Rating of Effective Leadership

Although they may help to explain differences between magnet and nonmagnet teachers' ratings of the effectiveness of their principals, school background variables account for little variance in effective leadership within these school types. It is interesting to note the relative lack of power of achievement data to predict effective leadership in this case. If teachers are accurate appraisers of effective principal leadership, test scores may be a weak tool to use for evaluation of leadership and to hold leaders accountable. The lack of a correlation between teachers' ratings of effective principal leadership and student outcomes in this study must be interpreted in light of the following caveats. First, the test scores are an aggregated composite and may be a weak measure of achievement. Second, no classroom level analyses were conducted in this study. Given these limitations, further investigation of the relationship between teachers' ratings and effective leadership and student achievement is warranted.

Indicators of teacher professionalism appear to be the strongest predictors of

effective principal leadership as rated by teachers. Teachers' perceptions of their opportunities to learn is the most powerful predictor of effective principal leadership in both school types. Teachers need and appreciate growth that empowers them to be more effective. This finding is consistent with contemporary relational views of leadership. From a relational viewpoint, "Leaders and followers alike participate in leadership; their effectiveness as leaders and as followers is the result of the nature of their participation in that process" (Drath, 1996, p. 2).

Other workplace conditions also serve as powerful predictors of teachers' ratings of effective principal leadership. Goal congruence and resources are significant predictors in both school types. However, the higher betas for these two variables in the nonmagnet regressions indicate that they may be even more critical in nonmagnet schools. While goal congruence is important to teachers' ratings of effective principal leadership in magnet schools, the magnet theme may help provide some of this and reduce the extent to which this is imperative to teachers' perceptions of effective leadership. Similarly, magnet schools appear to have more abundant resources than nonmagnets. In a setting where the level of resources is perceived to be appropriate, leadership centered around the procurement of additional resources may be viewed as extraneous.

This study provides potential insights into magnet and nonmagnet teachers' ratings of effective principal leadership in a single context of school choice. Further analysis of this relationship is clearly needed. For example, what is the relationship between leader substitutes and leader effectiveness? Are there more leader substitutes in schools of choice? What is the relationship between student achievement and teachers' perceptions of effective principal leadership? Finally, can principals apply findings on what they need to do to be perceived as effective in various contexts so that they have the personal power to mobilize people and resources necessary for school improvement.

References

Blank, R. (1986). *Principal leadership in urban high schools: Analysis of variation in leadership characteristics.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Blank, R. (1990). Educational effects of magnet schools. In W. Clune and J. Witte (Eds.), *Choice and control in American education, Vol. 2: The practice of choice, decentralization and school restructuring* (pp. 77-109). Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Blank, R., Dentler, R., Baltzell, D., and Chabotar, K. (1983). *Survey of magnet schools: Analyzing a model for quality integrated education,* Final report of a national study for the U.S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C.: James H. Lowry and Associates.

Blumberg, A. and Greenfield, W. (1986). *The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership.* Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bolman, L. G., Moore-Johnson, S., Murphy, J. T., Weiss, C. H. (1990). *Rethinking school leadership: An agenda for reform.* Occasional paper No. 1. Cambridge, MA: National Center for Educational Leadership.

Bolman, L. G. and Deal, T. E. (1991). *Reframing organizations*: Artistry, choice, and leadership. *San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.*

Bredeson, P. (1989). An analysis of the metaphorical perspectives of school principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 21(1), 29-50.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1992). *School Choice: A special report.* Princeton, NJ: Author.

Chubb, J. and Moe, T. (1990). *Politics markets & America's schools.* Washington,

Crow, G. (1991). *The principal in schools of choice: Middle manager, entrepreneur, and symbol manager.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Drath, W. H. (1996). Changing our minds about leadership. *Issues and observations*, 16(1), 1-4.

Elmore, R. F. (1979-80). Backward mapping: Implementation research and policy decisions. *Political Science Quarterly*, 94(4), 601-616.

Finn, C. E. (1990). Why we need choice. In W. L. Boyd and H. J. Walberh (Eds.), *Choice in education: Potential and problems* (pp. 3-19). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Goldring, E. B. (1993). Principals, parents, and administrative superiors.*Educational Administration Quarterly*, 29(1), 93-117.

Goldring, E. B. and Rallis, S. (1993). *Principals as environmental leaders: The external link for facilitating change.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta.

Hallinger, P. and Hausman, C. (1993). The changing role of the principal in a school of choice. In J. Murphy and P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts* (pp. 114-142). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Hallinger, P. and Hausman, C. (1994). From Atilla the Hun to Mary Had a Little lamb: Principal role ambiguity in restructured schools. In J. Murphy and K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts* (pp. 154-176). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hallinger, P. and Heck, R. (1996). the principal's role in school effectiveness: An assessment of methodological progress, 1980-1995. In K. Leithwood (Ed.), *The International Handbook of Research on Educational Leadership and Administration*. New York: Kluwer Press.

Hallinger, P. and Murphy, J. (1986). The social context of effective schools. *American Journal of Education*, 94, 328-355.

Kerchner, C. (1988). Bureaucratic entrepreneurship: The implications of choice for school administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 24(4), 381-392.

Lee, V. E., Smith, J. B., and Cioci, M. (1993). Teachers and principals: Gender-related perceptions of leadership and power in secondary schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15(2), 153-180.

Leithwood, K. A. (1988). *The nature, causes and consequences of principals' practices: A framework for research and review of recent literature.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Leithwood, K. A. and Stager, M. (1986). *Differences in problem solving processes used by moderately and highly effective principals.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Morgan, E. M. (1987). *Magnet schools: The role of the principal.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The American University, Washington, DC.

Morris, U. C., Crowson, R. L., Hurwitz, E., and Porter-Gehrie. (1982). *Principals in action.* Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Pitner, N. J. (1986). Substitutes for principal leader behavior: An exploratory study. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 22, 23-42.

Sergiovanni, T. (1992). *Moral leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Steel, L. and Levine, R. (1994). *Educational innovation in multiracial contexts: The growth of magnet schools in American education.* Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research.

Zheng, H. Y. (1996). *School contexts, principal characteristics, and instructional leadership effectiveness: A statistical analysis.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Appendix A:

Teachers' Ratings of Effective Principal Leadership (N=417).

Construct	Items	α=.8792
Effective Leadership		
	The principal is interested in innovative ideas	
	My principal indicates an awareness of what goes on in my classroom	
	My principal is highly visible around the school and makes many contacts with students and stafff	
	* The principal does a poor job of getting resources for this school	
	Extra efforts by staff are acknowledged and/or rewarded by my principal	
	The principal deals effectively with pressures from outside the school	

*=Reverse coded

Table 1: Means and Standard Deviations of Independent Variables by School Type

Variable	Magnet (N=231) Mean	S.D.	Nonmagnet (N=186) Mean	S.D.
Student Achievement	.629	.098	.420	.141
School Size	618.3	208.9	524.6	140.8
% Free/Reduced Lunch	.637	.248	.817	.213
Autonomy	3.14	.447	3.02	.512
Collegiality	3.02	.566	3.07	.626
Influence	2.85	.526	2.76	.530
Opportunity-to-Learn	2.50	.571	2.59	.577
Bureaucracy	2.57	.828	2.81	.805
Goal Congruence	3.15	.490	3.18	.530
Resources	2.70	.505	2.52	.548

Table 2: Teachers' Ratings of Effective Principal Leadership

School Type	N	Mean	Standard Dev.	Standard Error
Magnet	187	2.79	.623	.046
Nonmagnet	153	2.97	.686	.055

t	Df	2-tail prob.
-2.02	338	.0444

Table 3: Regression Coefficients of Effects on Magnet Teachers' Ratings of Effective Principal Leadership (N=231)

School Background Variables	Effective Leadership (β)
Student Achievement	.127
School Size	-.209**
% Free/Reduced Lunch	.018
Significant F=.010	R^2=.060

Teacher Professionalism	Effective Leadership (β)
Autonomy	.108*
Collegiality	.003
Influence	.073
Opportunity-to-Learn	.758***
Significant F=.000	R^2= .628

Other Workplace Conditions	Effective Leadership (β)
Bureaucracy	-.227***
Goal Congruence	.473***
Resources	.186**
Significant F=.000	R^2=.455

*p<.o5 **p<.01 **p<.001

Table 4: Regression Coefficients of Effects on Nonmagnet Teachers' Ratings of Effective Principal Leadership (N=186)

School Background Variables	Effective Leadership (β)
Student Achievement	.286***
School Size	.125
% Free/Reduced Lunch	.344***
Significant F=.000	R^2=.128

Teacher Professionalism	Effective Leadership (β)
Autonomy	.101
Collegiality	.127
Influence	..153
Opportunity-to-Learn	.551***
Significant F=.000	R^2= .669

Other Workplace Conditions	Effective Leadership (β)
Bureaucracy	.010
Goal Congruence	.658***
Resources	.193**
Significant F=.000	R^2=.584

*p<.o5 **p<.01 **p<.001